DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 307 80 SP 011 945

AUTHOR Andrews, Theodore E., Ed.
TITLE PBTE (Performance-Based Teacher Education); Vol. 3, No. 2, May 1974.
INSTITUTION Multi-State Consortium on Perfcrmance-Based Teacher Education, Albany, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 13p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *States Powers; *Teacher Certification; *Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

This issue of the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education (PBTE) contains: (1) competency based teacher education and certification activities at six Utah universities and by the Utah State Board of Education; (2) the Texas State Attorney General's opinion on the lack of power on the part of the State Board of Education to require all teacher preparation programs to be competency based; (3) an excerpt from a speech by Dan Ganeles, SUNY/Albany on "CBTE: Definitions, Criteria"; (4) a discussion on the use of instructional mini-lessons as criteria measures for evaluating a PBTE program; (5) humanistic strategies for implementing PBTE, perfcrmance based evaluation, and teacher accountability standards; (6) a humorous look at the next educational fad: "Course-Credit Teacher Education" (CCTE); and (7) a report on the Hofstra-Manhasset project investigating performance evaluation. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED147307

PBTE

PERFORMANCE - BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

Published by the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education

Vol. 3, No. 2 May 1974

Competency-Based Teacher Education and Certification Activities in Utah

by Roger C. Mouritsen
Coordinator, Teacher Personnel
Utah State Board of Education

Because of the growing interest in CBE in the Nation and in the State of Utah, and because all of our institutions are very interested in exploring this relatively new concept, much progress has been made, within each of the institutions, which exemplifies the desire for Utah teacher education institutions to remain at the forefront of the educational process.

Brigham Young University

BYU has probably been in the CBE business as long as any institution in Utah, or the Nation, for that matter. They began some six years ago to individualize and modularize their secondary program, and under the acronym ISTEP they now provide an alternative competency-based route for about 125 secondary students per year. Under the leadership of Dr. Hugh Baird the program makes extensive use of sophisticated learning packages and assessment procedures. The program is well known nationally and Dr. Baird and his staff are called upon to consult throughout the country. Since the inception of the ISTEP program, a new elementary track has been initiated which relies greatly on the competency-based concept. The elementary program is widely objectified and students begin in their freshman year to follow a specific course based on abilities which they bring into the program and which provides for continuous progress worked out by the student and professional staff. The elementary program exemplifies the idea of early and graduated experience using the field-centered mode. As sophomores the students spend a great deal of time in classrooms in tutoring, aiding, and becoming generally familiar with classroom procedure. The staff at BYU have been instrumental in assisting the San Juan School District to operate one of the most successful career opportunity programs in the Nation. To date, 16 Navaho teachers have been graduated and most of this is because of the tremendous ability of the College of Education at Brigham Young University to adapt to a rural teacher education model. Professional staff from BYU have offered in the field, that is in the San Juan District, those classes which have been able to provide all of the experiences needed to assist the students to graduate with a teacher certificate. The students do spend each summer on campus at BYU for some classes which they are not able to get in the field, but by and large it has been a field-centered project. The classes which are offered in the COP program follow a competency-based format. The students are self-paced and proceed according to their ability and skills. Perhaps because of the influence of the ISTEP program, the COP program and the elementary education program at BYU, the use of competency-based education methods have permeated other areas of Brigham Young University. Many of the general education classes are now individualized and the use of modularized or packaged materials is in evidence. Students are allowed to go at their own rate and many professors are no longer adopting the lecture as the only method of teaching, but are becoming consultants and directors of learning in the classroom. Students report great satisfaction at being able to complete the course work at their own rate, sometimes in half the time or less, and are able to go on to other interests.

Utah State University

The interest in competency-based teacher education at USU has been mainly centered on the new competency-based elementary education model developed by the elementary staff under the direction of Dr. Ron Petrie. This program is similar to the BYU elementary program in that the students receive a great deal of exposure to practical elementary education in their sophomore year and, because of the extent to which this program is field-centered, students at the end of their senior year have spent the equivalent of one academic year in the public schools. Because the program does not follow the ordinary pattern of classes which last for one quarter, it is able to encompass elements such as variability in students — which refers to exceptional children, world of work, or career education components and other similar inclusions. The program

(Continued on page 2)

California Joins Consortium

The California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing accepted in March an invitation to become a member of the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education. Eleven states (Washington, Oregon, Utah, Arizona, Texas, Minnesota, Vermont, New York, Florida, New Jersey, California) are now members of the Consortium.

SP011 945

makes great use of the portal school concept, the portal school being an elementary school which has a commitment to teacher education and where the staff is trained to accept large groups of students and assist in a very real and active way in the learning process. The USU competency-based elementary education program recently received one of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education's distinguished achievement awards at its annual meeting in Chicago. Of the hundred-plus nominees, this program was one of nine which received an award. The State Board of Education has funded an evaluation of this program which is now in progress and which, because of sophisticated design, will be able to assess whether or not students are able to do a better job as teachers after going through this program than by following traditional route. USU has many other interests in CBE. Among those is an evaluation system which was developed by David Stone of the psychology department and Carolyn Steel from the dean's office. This system has been used to evaluate other CBTE programs throughout the State and is receiving some national attention at this time and illustrates the interest of the staff to go beyond the development of competencies and to get into the very difficult area of assessment. Whenever a new program or a revision of an old program is presented to the State Board of Education for approval for certification, the academic or education departments involved have attempted to revise the program on a competency base. Many areas are in the process of doing this at the present time, and through the efforts of Dean Ballam this will no doubt continue. The professional staff in the College of Education at USU have taken a positive attitude toward CBTE and are attempting to seek out assistance in converting their programs.

Southern Utah State College

SUSC began its exploration of CBTE under the direction of Morris Shirts, former dean. The concept has received additional emphasis from the new dean, Kent Myers. Over the last several years the staff has conducted followup of their graduates and are determined to revise their program to make it more practical and relevant to the students who will become teachers. Part of this revamping includes the development of competencies, measurement devices, and evaluation procedures. Because of the strong commitment on the part of the staff, they were granted funds from the State Board of Education for a monthlong workshop which was held last summer and included all of the staff of the department of education. In this retreat the staff was able to wrestle with the very thorny problems surrounding CBTE and were able to set directions for the future. Many of the staff have already outlined their programs in terms of behavioral objectives and are allowing the students some flexibility in pacing, etc. The staff at SUSC are very concerned about the humanistic and affective aspects of CBTE and one of their best products thus far is an evaluation instrument which allows them to get at the selection of students which have the human qualities which they feel will allow them to become successful teachers.

Westminster College

Because Westminster is a small school which must rely heavily on a modicum of cooperation between the education staff and other departments on campus, the approach on the part of Martha Monroe and her colleagues has been to involve everyone on campus as far as possible in the development of a competency-based teacher education program. They have held several meetings where they have sought the advice of State Board of Education specialists in an attempt to revise their program. In a sense, the Westminster program has been competency-based because of the ability of the staff to communicate directly and effectively with each of their teacher candidates. They see CBE as a way to improve what they now have and to be able to better identify the competencies which they want their teachers to possess.

University of Utah

Efforts toward competency-based teacher education at the University of Utah have been in several directions. For about two years, staff members in the media area have been meeting weekly to identify competencies and to work on measurement and evaluation devices. This project is now well under way and is destined to have an impact on media programs throughout the State. This has come about because of a grant from the State Board of Education which, in addition to assisting the University of Utah media staff, will provide the inclusion of representatives from other institutions and allow them to exchange ideas. There has also been a great deal of work in the early childhood area at the University of Utah and this promises to produce an exemplary early childhood certificate program. Another program which has been in the development stages for about two years is the Life Involvement Model, which began under the direction of Asahel Woodruff and is continuing now with Phil Kapfer as director and Asahel Woodruff as director emeritus. This is a whole new approach to education which has as one of its products a competency-based teacher education model. Some of the highlights of this program are that the teacher candidates spend two quarters full time in a LIM school and are given instruction in methods and other areas while at the school. This program is heavily funded by the State Board of Education and is also presently included as an alternative program in teacher education in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Utah.

Another area which has not received a great deal of publicity statewide but is well known nationally is the competency-based program for the training of supervisors, conducted by Dr. Lloyd McCleary. This program is fully mediated and modularized and deals with a specific set of competencies which have been identified by Dr. McCleary and which allows the students to progress at their own rate. The departments of secondary education and elementary education are exploring with interest the competency-based movement, and there is evidence that some components will soon find their way into the elementary and secondary programs.

Weber State College

The competency-based teacher education at Weber State College has completed three years of operation and has become one of the outstanding programs in the Nation. It has received the AACTE distinguished achievement award and continues to be visited by people from all over the Nation. The program contains the entire professional component for teachers and there is no alternative program. There are about 500 students in the program at any given time, and the entire sequence is modularized through learning packages called WILKITS (Weber Individualized Learning Kits) which include the self-pacing element. The Utah State Board of Education has evaluated the Weber State program and has found it contains many very positive aspects. There are some gaps in the program as measured by the instrument developed by David Stone at USU, but the staff at Weber State are constantly working to revise the WILKITS and to include elements in the program which have been missing. The reception of the program on the public school level has been very good and administrators report that students coming from the program are as well or better qualified for the profession of teaching. Weber State College has a Teacher Corps program which embodies many elements of the competency-based program. This is an intern program which is field based, and the CBTE program at Weber

(Continued on page 3)

Utah . . . *(continued)*

State has provided a sound basis for the Teacher Corps program.

Weber State is also involved in a Career Opportunities program and, as far as possible, the COP students are allowed to take advantage of the competency-based program. There has been a great deal of interest on the part of other departments at the college to receive assistance from the education staff to help develop learning modules in the other disciplines. It is interesting to note that teachers who have graduated from Weber State College in education have been able to effect some change in the traditional pattern of teaching in their school assignments, in that they have been able to individualize their instruction following the model that they have been exposed to on the Weber State College campus.

Other Areas of Competency-Based Activity

Using standards which have been developed by the National Association of Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, Utah is now evaluating each teacher preparation institution every five years on a competency-based format. This format requires the institution to define at the outset in a competency mode the product it is attempting to produce, and then to identify the course work activities which will lead to the knowledge, skills, and sensitivities which it feels teachers will need. This format has been very helpful in assisting institutions to move to a competency-based program.

There has been a great deal of effort on the part of many State Board of Education specialists to develop competency-based standards. In the media area, guidelines have already been adopted by the State board which provide an alternative route to those people who desire certification in the media area. Other efforts are under way in driver education, foreign languages, school counselors, social workers and psychologists, physical education and recreation teachers, and other areas to develop similar guidelines which will assist institutions in the preparation of educators. There has been a great deal of work with the Utah Education Association to publicize competency-based teacher education and certification. There is a series of workshops under way at the present time which are being held on a regional basis sponsored by the State Board of Education and the UEA which present CBE concepts to teachers. This has been most valuable in bringing teachers up to date on the state of the art. There also exists in the State an organization called the Association of Teacher Educators, which has received a great deal of support in the past from the Division of Instructional Support Services, and the goals of this organization in the past year have been, among other things, to advance the cause of CBTE.

There have been many conferences held in the past three years on the subject of CBTE which have been organized by the Division of Instructional Support Services, which have provided information to educators from every level regarding the movement. Staff members in the Division of Instructional Support Services have been speakers at many instate and out-of-state meetings on the subject.

Finally, Utah is very fortunate in being a member of the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, which is now in its third year of funding and has provided several thousand dollars of aid to Utah to explore the competency-based movement. Staff members have been able to attend workshops and conferences which have provided a great deal of assistance and aid. The Consortium has published a newsletter which has been one of the finest of its type in the country and has also published many books and pamphlets by nationally recognized authors in the area of CBE. As a result of membership in the Multi-State Consortium, the agency has been made aware of many of the vicissitudes which are apparent in any new development of this kind. As a result we have become wary of state and legislative mandates which would impose a CBE system before the proper groundwork has been laid.

Competency/Performance-Based Teacher Education and Texas Attorney General's Opinion No. H-197

by Tom T. Walker, Director
Division of Teacher Education and Certification
Texas Education Agency

The competency/performance-based teacher education movement was the energizing force which resulted in a recent Texas Attorney General's Opinion regarding the authority of the Texas State Commissioner of Education and State Board of Education. In Opinion H-197 rendered on January 4, 1974, Attorney General John L. Hill held that neither the Texas State Commissioner of Education nor the Texas State Board of Education has the authority to require that teacher preparation programs presented for approval be performance based.

On June 10, 1972, the Texas State Board of Education approved recommendations submitted by a task force on professional personnel preparation and certification which had been appointed three years earlier.[1] These recommendations, which initiated the competency/performance-based teacher education debate in Texas are the following:

. . . we recommend that the State Board of Education:

1. Establish . . . intent and direction for instituting a competency/performance based program of teacher education and certification in Texas — this new program to be based upon demonstrated competence and performance of professional activities identified with effective teaching.
2. Establish a five-year transitional period to begin September 1, 1972, for the development and implementation of the new program with the requirement that any new programs approved for an institution after September 1, 1972, be competency/performance based.

(Continued on page 4)

Texas . . . *(continued)*

3. Direct institutions with approved programs, in cooperation with local education agencies and with professional organizations, to begin the immediate phasing in of competency/performance based programs with the goal of completing the conversion of these presently approved programs by September 1, 1977.
4. Instruct the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education to encourage continued flexibility and experimentation with a variety of approaches and carefully evaluated results while phasing in the new program and the structure necessary for successful implementation.[2]

Although the recommendations resulted from a very strong feeling that current programs of preparation are not producing the level of competence in beginning teachers needed by pupils, desired by parents, required by job role expectations, and wished for by beginning teachers themselves, and although the intent was very simple, straightforward, and aboveboard, the impact of the Board's decision was such that a debate soon developed and the authority of the State Board of Education was brought into question.

As a result of the questions raised regarding the authority of the State Board of Education, the State Commissioner of Education, Dr. J. W. Edgar, acting on behalf of the Board, requested on July 23, 1973, an opinion of the Texas Attorney General regarding the authority of the State Board of Education. In his request, Commissioner Edgar asked the Attorney General for his opinion on the following specific questions:

1. Is it within the authority of the State Commissioner of Education and/or State Board of Education to include in the provisions for approval of teacher education programs the stipulation that the higher education institutions seeking approval must present a performance based application for approval?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is in the negative, is it within the authority of the State Commissioner of Education and/or the State Board of Education to include in the provisions for approval of teacher education programs two or more alternative plans, only one of which would be performance based, wherefrom the higher education institution may elect to use the alternative of its choice as a basis for presenting an application for approval.[3]

In Opinion No. H-197, Attorney General Hill wrote eight pages on the ramification of the Board's authority and on how he arrived at his conclusion. He then spoke specifically, in a one-paragraph summary, to Commissioner Edgar's two questions. His statement is the following:

SUMMARY

Under present Texas law, it is not within the authority of the State Board of Education or the State Commissioner of Education to stipulate that institutions seeking approval for teacher education programs must present " performance-based " applications, but the Board, with the advice of the Commissioner, may promulgate rules and regulations whereby institutions seeking such approval could choose between alternative plans for program approval (one of which might be " performance based ") and submit applications accordingly.[4]

It should be noted that the two questions asked by Commissioner Edgar were specific and regarded only the authority of the Texas State Commissioner of Education and State Board of Education. They did not concern the legality of the performance/competency-based approach to teacher preparation. It should also be noted that Attorney General Hill's opinion summary was just as specific.

Concern has been expressed as to whether Texas Opinion No. H-197 might have the potential of being precedent for opinions in other states. A careful study of the wording of the Texas opinion will make it clear that such concerns should not be entertained. The Texas opinion states very specifically that under present Texas law the Texas State Board of Education does not have the authority which is assumed it had.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a summary account of the work of the task force see Tom T. Walker, " Texas Education/Certification Project," PBTE, Vol. 2, No. 1, April 1973.
2. " Report of Committee and Commission to the State Commissioner of Education on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers, Administrators, and Other School Personnel in Texas," Austin, Texas, May 15, 1972.
3. J. W. Edgar, Commissioner of Education of Texas, to John L. Hill, Attorney General of Texas, Austin, Texas, August 9, 1973.
4. John L. Hill, Attorney General of Texas, to J. W. Edgar, Commissioner of Education of Texas, January 4, 1974, *Opinion No. H-197*, p. 930.

Competence-Based Teacher Education: Definitions, Criteria

by Dan Ganeles
Teacher Corps
State University of New York at Albany

This article is an edited version of a longer paper. The complete work may be obtained from the author on request.

All programs recognize that teacher education must provide learners with opportunities to develop and means to demonstrate: (1) theoretical knowledge in a variety of content areas and processes; (2) useful technical teaching skills; (3) criteria for the selection of appropriate content, process, and assessment objectives; (4) certain kinds of experiences to enhance both the cognitive processes involved in becoming a teacher, and, as importantly, the teacher's affective development; (5) finally, with professional supervision, the learner must have the opportunity to " put it all together " in real and/or simulated settings.

A Competence-Based Teacher Education program differs from the traditional not in intent nor content, but in form and process. That is, Competence-Based Teacher Education programs require the specification of intended learning objectives, or outcomes, arrived at through a collaborative decision-making process involving presently active professional teachers, school administrators, university personnel, and learners. The program then makes the objectives public and explicit to the learners prior to instruction; that is, it informs the learners what they or their tutees (students) must know, do, or experience in order to qualify for entry as a beginning teacher. Additionally, the program takes the responsibility to provide a rationale (a reason why any objective or program component is important), information about how attainment of the objective will be assessed and by what criterion, and instruction directly related to the objectives specified.

Since competence-based teacher education demands that each learner give evidence of specified knowledge, skills, and experiences attained, it puts into practice the often talked about, seldom attained educational virtues of personalizing instruction. It also emphasizes learner responsibility for learning and demonstrating the appropriate selection and application of the learning.

(Continued on page 5)

Definitions . . . *(continued)*

Certain critics of competence-based teacher education have argued that this form of teacher education assumes that "the teaching act is the sum of performances into which it is analyzed," (Broudy), and "It (CBTE) presumes to reduce teaching to a set of performances that can be imitated by relatively untrained people such as para-professionals" (Griffiths). On the contrary, competence-based teacher education operates on the premise that the teaching act is *greater* than the sum of the performances. Simply performing the specified discrete acts bears little relationship to the role of teachers. No competence-based teacher education program would be complete without requiring those persons being prepared as teachers to select and apply those performance skills, climates, materials, or resources which in their best judgment, based on theory and practice, would best help their students to attain learning objectives. We refer to this phase in the Competence-Based Teacher Preparation Program as the "orchestration phase." It is best accomplished in a clinic teaching period where teachers-to-be have continuing responsibility for the educational development of learners in field settings, under supervision, after mastering a "repertoire" of discrete performances and skills.

This "orchestration phase" requires selection by the teacher-to-be of skills, performances, climates, and resources based on knowledge of educational, psychological, and sociological processes and theories, interacting with the personality and artistry of the teacher. It calls for the appropriate mix of the technology of the teaching act, a theoretical framework for selection of those acts, and the artistry of the personality making the selections.

Minilessons as Criterion Variables for Evaluating Competency-Based Teacher Education Programs

by W. James Popham
University of California, Los Angeles

For the second consecutive year, instructional minilessons have been used as a criterion measure indicating that a performance-oriented UCLA teacher education program is helping teacher candidates acquire an important instructional competency. After the recently concluded fall term, prospective elementary and secondary teachers displayed significantly increased skill in promoting learner attainment of prespecified cognitive and affective outcomes. This brief report will describe the use of instructional minilessons as a criterion measure for evaluating a competency-based teacher education program.

UCLA's teacher education operation is organized in a unique manner, with six faculty and student teams emphasizing essentially different approaches to preservice preparation. Several of these programs, operating within the UCLA Teacher Education Laboratory, can properly be classified as performance-based since the competencies sought for students are, for the most part, both well explicated and actually measured. The largest of these UCLA groups is Team S, staffed this year by Professors Evan R. Keislar, George F. Kneller, John D. McNeil, and the writer. During the 10-week fall quarter, 160 elementary and secondary candidates completed two Team S courses in (1) instructional methodology and (2) educational psychology.

One aim of the fall quarter was to increase the candidates' competence to effect changes in learners. To this end a candidate teaches a minilesson consisting of a standardized instructional task in which the teacher receives a specific instructional objective along with background information needed to design a lesson to accomplish the objective. The teacher then plans a 15- to 20-minute lesson intended to (1) accomplish the cognitive objective, and (2) be judged as interesting by the learners. After teaching the lesson to a small group of learners (who might be either children or other teacher education candidates), a posttest is given to the learners. The posttest has not been previously seen by the teacher, but its nature is readily inferable from the information available to the teacher. Learners are also asked to rate (on a five-point scale) how interesting the lesson was. Thus, both a cognitive and affective index of the teacher's ability is available.

Although superficially similar to the popular microteaching lessons, these sorts of minilessons are basically different. Whereas microteaching tends to focus on the *process* of teaching, minilessons focus on the *results* of teaching. A teacher's instructional skill is judged in terms of cognitive and affective evidence from learners after instruction. Attention to teaching procedures is given on the basis of whether the minilesson's results were good or bad. Because minilessons have been used for several years at UCLA, normative data are available which permit comparisons of a prospective teacher's results with those of 25 or more comparable prospective teachers.

In the Team S program, prospective teachers each week in a *minilesson clinic*, a 1-hour session in which one student teaches a minilesson to six classmates while two other classmates and a teaching assistant serve as instructional analysts. At the close of the 15- to 20-minute lesson, learners' average posttest scores and interest ratings are quickly computed. Then a postlesson analysis is conducted based on the learners' performances, i.e., superior results leading to an analysis of the effective techniques employed by the teacher, and inferior results leading to an analysis of deficiencies in the teacher's techniques. Both the cognitive and the affective results are employed as criteria guiding these analyses. The minilessons used are available commercially (IAS, Box 24821, Los Angeles, Calif. 90024).

A major goal of the Team S program is to increase teacher candidates' mastery of the skill represented in the minilessons, that is, the ability to promote learner attainment of prespecified cognitive objectives with a lesson which will be judged interesting by learners. To evaluate the degree to which this goal was achieved, for the past two years the performance of minilesson teachers late in the course (weeks 9 and 10) has been contrasted with that of minilesson teachers early in the course (weeks 1 and 2).

Both the teachers and their classmate-learners were randomly assigned to teach one of several minilessons. Conditions for all minilessons were essentially comparable. Because the different minilessons represented

(Continued on page 6)

varying levels of difficulty, all teachers' performances, namely, their learners' average posttest scores and interest ratings, were converted to standard scores in order to permit a statistical comparison of the pooled early-in-course and late-in-course data. Results of these analyses for the 1972–73 and 1973–74 fall terms are presented in Table 1.

As seen in Table 1, for both years the Team S students have been able to display significantly superior performance in the minilessons taught late in the term, that superiority being reflected on both the cognitive and affective results of their teaching efforts. In some cases the superiority represented almost a full standard deviation's growth. It should be noted that the superior performance does not stem from prior familiarity with a particular teaching task, but is displayed on previously untaught lessons. Although members of the Team S faculty are encouraged by these results, they believe that by increasing the amount of supervised practice our candidates have with minilessons, improvement could be even more dramatic.

Although minilessons have not yet been refined to the point that they can be employed in the evaluation of an individual teacher education candidate, as a program evaluation criterion measure for competency-based teacher education endeavors, they may offer considerable promise. In that regard, of course, their value as instructional improvement devices also would seem to warrant consideration.

Table 1
Analyses of UCLA's Team S early-in-course and late-in-course standard score minilesson results for 1972–73 and 1973–74.

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t	Probability *
1972–73					
Cognitive					
Early-in-course	11	45.5	7.9	2.3	.05
Late-in-course	13	53.8	9.3		
Affective					
Early-in-course	11	44.7	5.6	2.6	.01
Late-in-course	13	54.5	10.9		
1973–74					
Cognitive					
Early-in-course	36	46.6	10.3	2.6	.01
Late-in-course	33	52.9	9.5		
Affective					
Early-in-course	36	45.7	8.0	4.1	.01
Late-in-course	33	54.7	9.9		

* one-tailed

Education Week At Chautauqua Institution

Competency-based education will be the theme of one of the workshops sponsored during the Chautauqua Institution's 100th anniversary summer program during the week of July 14–20.

Featured as part of a weeklong series of meetings focusing on successes in American education, the workshop on competency education will provide study opportunities with a cadre of national consultants from the performance education field.

Concurrent workshops will also be held during that week on educational alternatives, teaching centers, and protocol and training materials.

The Chautauqua Institution, located on Chautauqua Lake in southwestern New York State, provides a summerlong program of recreation and study. A symphony orchestra, special attractions (Jacques d'Amboise and Allegra Kent, ballet stars, are scheduled to appear during education week), superb summer recreation facilities, and stimulating programs featuring nationally known speakers are all part of a typical Chautauqua week.

The programs are open to the public at large on a weekly or daily basis. Persons interested in obtaining further information about the education week program should write:

Dr. Richard Collier
State University College at Buffalo
1300 Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14222
Telephone (716) 862–5022

Competency Process: A Humanistic Strategy for Public Policy Change

by Robert Lewis Piper
Human Response Associates, Inc.

A common and sometimes successful pattern for initiating change in educational and other institutional settings is via the authoritarian mode. The moves toward competency-based teacher training, systems of performance-based evaluation of teachers, and accountability of administrators are often implemented in such a pattern, though authoritarianism is usually disguised with democratic or consensual rhetoric.

Theoretically authoritarianism might be legitimate, but in 20th century America it is a failure on two counts. First, it does not work. The subjects are more sophisticated or, as some would say, in rebellion. Principals have their own sense of expertise, teachers are organized into powerful groups, pupils have rights, and parents will clamor that they be respected. Throughout the educational structure, power is diffused. Second, the authoritarian mode runs against prevailing conceptions of right and wrong. It is an affront to the dignity of the individual and to a "decent respect for the opinion of mankind."

Development of Competency Process

As a response to this failure and within the context of the alternative value system, a unique strategy for designing and implementing performance- or competency-based instruction and teaching have been developed by Human Response Associates of Spring House, Pennsylvania. The HRA strategy, referred to as Competency Process, seeks to energize widespread creative ability and to utilize representative constituent groups in designing and implementing policy.

The thesis on which Competency Process rests is that the most effective and humane way to institute change is to involve those affected by change in its planning and im-

(Continued on page 7)

Competency . . . *(continued)*

plementation. While this concept itself is not new, its application in public policy situations have been few. Competency Process conceptualizes and systemizes this application.

Its style is the utilization of group techniques, of inclusive abilities, and of collaborative judgments. Coupled with this style is a basic respect for the individuality and for the integrity of each person engaged in the policy change.

Competency Process organizes change through a complex network of activities. Each of these activities is designed to involve individuals of different backgrounds and different abilities in responsible and useful roles. For example, college faculties in schools of education might be trained to play leadership roles with public school systems and with public school teachers in implementing a competency-based inservice training program. Another example might be the development of a workshop involving teachers, administrators, college faculty members, parents, and citizens in collaborative functions to find desirable competencies or performance for teachers or for pupils.

Flexibility of Application

Competency Process may be defined as a comprehensive strategy for implementing change in public policy and behavior within a variety of institutional settings.

It may be applied statewide or it may be successfully utilized by a local school district or by a legislative committee of a governing board. It is a strategy that schools of education, in redefining their teacher training programs, have found uniquely useful.

The recent example of the application of competency process in Pennsylvania illustrates the adaptability of the strategy.

Pennsylvania was one of the first states to institute CBTE in 1970 when the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) asked the 83 state-approved programs to describe their teacher training in competency terms. In 1972, PDE invited Human Response Associates, a group of professionals and practitioners in education, program evaluation, psychology, and mental health, to conceptualize a process or strategy to translate the particularistic program statements into an initial statewide inventory of generic teaching competencies. HRA approached its assignment in its fullest dimensions, first conducting preliminary research to identify the statewide dynamic of CBTE implementation. This research involved legal and other document review, statistical studies, and interviewing key informants. On the basis of these findings, HRA, with officials in PDE, developed a detailed and long-range strategy for implementing competency-based teacher education in Pennsylvania. In the case of Pennsylvania as in other state or local situations, the first need is to conduct a diagnostic study to identify the situational dynamic for implementing the program.

In Pennsylvania the Competency Process strategy did not aim toward a specific product, an interim inventory of generic competencies — it was a way of arriving at the product. According to the Competency Process strategy the implementing system must be governed by the maximum involvement of the most people in responsible work and decisional activities, and this must be true throughout the time and space dimensions within the universe in which the policy is to be implemented.

The Role of the Creative Facilitator

The role of HRA in Competency Process is not to define competencies or to specify performance or to conceptualize or implement an accountability system. Rather it is, while being responsive to an evolving process and responsible to a concept of how to implement public policy, to act as a creative and conscientious facilitator.

This role has two distinct aspects. One of them is developmental and the other continuing. First, HRA developed the concept of Competency Process in its philosophical outline and in its ideological base. The concept and resultant strategy of Competency Process and the continuing role of HRA as creative facilitator has been field tested, and this experience has offered the opportunity to perfect the design of its particulars. Further, implementation of the concept has produced within the HRA staff a group of professional practitioners highly skilled in the application of Competency Process.

The second aspect of the HRA role is a continuing one. The dimensions of this role are:

- to research and diagnose unique institional and process dynamics
- to conceptualize the overall strategy for implementing competency- or performance-based teacher education or instruction and systems of accountability at a variety of sites and situations
- to protect collaborative and creative operating modes at all stages of policy development and implementation
- to provide an array of resolution activities which could include training seminars and leadership development workshops
- to organize supporting activities such as data processing and information-disseminating network, and research and editorial services
- to manage the process of generating evolving definitions of competency, performance, and accountability
- to facilitate the flow of planning and design within the parameters of the implementing universe.

Size, Site, and Stage

The application of Competency Process may take place at any stage of policy implementation from original conceptualization and formal authorization through the sequence of implementing steps. Likewise, a variety of implementation jurisdictions or institutional settings are receptive to these strategies. An independent school district may employ Competency Process as usefully as a large university school of education or a statewide association of teachers.

The critical components of Competency Process are not controlled by size, site, or stage of implementation. It is the emphasis on process toward product within a humanistic context. It utilizes diverse professional and nonprofessional skills. It stimulates the creative energies of all those affected by the policy shift. These are the critical ingredients of Competency Process.

DEJA VUE

by Robert A. Roth
State Department of Education
Michigan

The scene is the AACTE-ATE national convention held in Chicago, the year is 2024. What you are about to witness has been described as the "great debate" and is a climax of a series of bitter articles concerning a new approach to teacher education labeled "course credit teacher education" (CCTE). Traditional teacher education (formerly called PBTE, then CBTE, and recently mastery-based teacher education, MBTE) has been firmly entrenched for the past 40 to 50 years. Comments concerning "traditional" teacher education refer to this established competency approach.

The supporter of the new approach, Dr. O. F. Course, is a fairly young but experienced professor from a western university. The opponent, Dr. E. N. Trenched, is also a professor but he is not far from retirement and is teaching at an established eastern college. He is very highly regarded in the profession and he appears to exude sophistication with perhaps even a touch of arrogance, although not intentional.

A large audience has assembled and has literally packed the grand auditorium. From the various conversations among those in the audience it is apparent that they are

(Continued on page 8)

Deja . . . *(continued)*

there for a variety of reasons. There are the curiosity seekers, who know very little about the new course approach and hence view it very suspiciously. There are those who have built their own image of CCTE but actually misunderstand it and view it (or their perception of it) with amusement. There are those who have picked up only fragments of it and are very angry. They have come to see Dr. E. N. Trenched "unfrock" this upstart program and reveal its inherent weaknesses. There are others, a small number, who just want to know more about it, and an even smaller number who are genuinely interested.

We pick up the debate just as the opening barb is administered.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Let me be sure I understand what CCTE is. Incidently, last month I thought it was called subject-based teacher education and the month before that title-based. I wish you could at least come to some agreement on what to call it.

DR. O. F. COURSE: Before you go on let me clarify that. These terms are generally used synonomously, but course-credit teacher education (CCTE) is a more generic label and is now preferred.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Very well, as you like. Now, this business about what it is. What you are proposing is to structure your teacher education program on a series of broad areas or titles which you will call "courses," and each course must be completed within its own predetermined period of time.

DR. O. F. COURSE: Yes, that is reasonably close, with one exception. Each course does not have its own time period, all courses are assigned the same period of time, usually a semester.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Do you mean to tell me that you are assuming all objectives can be achieved in the same amount of time?

DR. O. F. COURSE: We don't have specific objectives so I can't really answer that. We provide course descriptions which are goals for that course. Each professor then teaches what he wants in the time available. It simply makes sense that each professor teach what he knows best. The goals are purposely vague so the student has a chance to explore.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Well then on what criteria is the student evaluated?

DR. O. F. COURSE: Oh, I have very specific criteria which I use in grading exams and papers.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Why don't you make these available to students and base your courses on these?

DR. O. F. COURSE: I would be very concerned about "teaching to the test."

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: By that do you mean teaching to the objectives or the specific test questions?

DR. O. F. COURSE: I mean the objectives.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: What's wrong with that?

DR. O. F. COURSE: Every student has his own goals and must be allowed to pursue them.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: But they are all nevertheless tested on the same criteria? You approach the problem by just not stating objectives yet testing everyone on the same hidden criteria. I am confused.

DR. O. F. COURSE: Well, you must admit that we have much to learn about which teacher competencies relate to student outcomes, although we have made significant progress in the past 50 years.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: I suppose that's true, but I don't see how you will ever find out anything about this relationship in your system. How would you respond to the recent report from the Cranford Research Institute of Cranford University, which states that "the lack of research regarding the relationship between courses and pupil outcomes is CCTE's greatest problem."

[the crowd buzzes]

DR. O. F. COURSE: If we don't get a chance to try our program, how can we test its effectiveness?

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: I still say if you don't have objectives and competencies stated I don't know how you'll ever find out what works and what doesn't.

DR. O. F. COURSE: And I still maintain that we must have the opportunity to try it. In the BM* days this would have been possible. In fact, traditional competency-based programs never would have existed without opportunities for experimental programs. The mandate from the state has removed that possibility. And don't give me that argument about being regenerative and hence constantly revising and meeting needs, even if it means program structure changes.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: I was about to do precisely that. However, you do have a point about opportunity to experiment.

Let me pursue this course business again. How does each professor know what is being taught in the other's course, isn't there a great deal of overlap and gaps? Doesn't this produce an inefficient system?

DR. O. F. COURSE: Quite to the contrary, course descriptions are sufficient to prevent this, and our course programs can be much more efficient. We have devised a very clever means to cut costs. You see, we have eliminated modules and all the superfluous support materials. We also no longer have need for intricate management or support systems since each professor requires a textbook and lectures, and we don't keep track of every individual. We find it much cheaper to bring together large groups of students to hear lectures. This lecture concept was one of our better moves.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Of course we have lectures but only as options. The significance of your statement, however, is that you herd students into large rooms and pack them in like sardines,

[the audience begins to feel uncomfortable]

or robots, for most of your teaching and with no options. You do not provide for individual differences, and you foster sameness. I can only conclude that this is dehumanizing and mechanistic!

DR. O. F. COURSE: Not so, not so!

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: I suppose the next thing is you'll have State Education Departments jumping on the bandwagon.

[crowd grows angry, buzzing changes to hiss]

DR. O. F. COURSE: Oh, "poisoning the well" with the bandwagon syndrome eh!

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Explain that, if you will.

DR. O. F. COURSE: Every time a new idea comes around those who subscribe to it are accused of jumping on the bandwagon. This causes others to be reluctant because they don't want to be accused of jumping on a bandwagon. It's a neat ploy that was used effectively back in the early 1970's.

Incidentally, the other ploy frequently used is that whenever an option is finally proposed, the response is "let's look at all the options," as if there are a large number of options that have been sitting around waiting to be unveiled. Where have these options been for the past 50 years? As options are developed let's pursue them, but in the meantime let's not subscribe to the holding action of waiting for all the ships to come in.

(Continued on page 9)

---

* By the early 1980's, all 50 states had mandated competency-based programs. BM refers to Before Mandate, and all teacher education academic calendars are based on this significant event. Opponents of the competency approach have implied that a BM refers to the product of the programs. This has generated some antagonism.

Deja . . . *(continued)*

I have a slogan of my own: "CCTE is better, but it's just not easier to tell."

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: Yes, of course, whatever you say. You know, many people are saying that CCTE is just putting old wine in new bottles, but I think they are giving you more credit than is due. Also, your preoccupation with costs concerns me. Sacrificing quality and everything else seems to be infecting the country.

DR. O. F. COURSE: There is more to it than costs. We want the professors back in the colleges and universities and not in the schools, we hope to build tower classrooms, perhaps covered with ivy, for efficiency and esthetic effects.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: I couldn't have said it better myself.

[a titter throughout the audience]

I have two other important concerns. First, our traditional competency programs focus on two related themes: context-building, which provides the teacher with a theoretical foundation so that he may interpret situations appropriately (transfer of learning); and the requisite skills so that once the situation has been interpreted and a technique selected, the teacher has the ability to employ the technique effectively. A second concern is the affective domain. This is one of the most critical areas in teacher preparation, and our programs currently approach this by identifying the appropriate areas and then determining the specific human skills necessary to deal with these areas. How do you propose to deal with it?

DR. O. F. COURSE: In reference to your first question, we recognize the importance of interpretive context-building and offer a course in theory. The application of the theory receives significantly less attention. As for your second question, we find it to be such a difficult area that we don't try to determine what it takes to be "affective" (pardon the pun) in the classroom. Some of our course titles, however, reflect a concern for developing better adjusted individuals with knowledge in areas such as psychology and other social sciences.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: What evidence do you accept that the teacher has skill in this area?

DR. O. F. COURSE: Well, he must pass the course by paper and pencil examination. Then too, there is student teaching much later.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: I almost forgot, where in your program is the analysis of the teaching act and a synthesis or integration into a unique style built on basic skills?

DR. O. F. COURSE: We don't analyze it, we believe through enough theory and pictures of the "Gestalt" a style will develop.

DR. E. N. TRENCHED: It seems to me such an imitator would go through the process in a mindless way with no purpose to specific actions. We have seen this happen with student teachers following their cooperating teachers. We agree with the need for understanding the process as a whole, but certainly the functions of the parts are also important to understand. But no matter, the real test will be in the classroom.

* * *

The debate has now been concluded and the crowd begins to push its way out, with occasional debates between individuals in the audience springing up. This is a date to remember; teacher education has embarked on a new fetishism.

CASSETTES AVAILABLE

Cassettes of presentations given at a recent conference on competency education cosponsored by the Teacher Education Developmental Service, State University of New York at Albany, and the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, are now available in limited quantities to interested persons.

The following cassettes can be purchased for $2.50 each:

1. A dialog between Harry Broudy, professor emeritus at the University of Illinois, and Frederick McDonald of Educational Testing Service. (two cassettes)
2. A dialog between Karl Massanari of the AACTE, and George Dickson of the University of Toledo. (one cassette)
3. An address by Patrick Daly, vice president of the American Federation of Teachers, discussing the AFT's views on competency-based education. (one-cassette)
4. An address by Allen Schmieder, operations coordinator, National Center for Improvement of Education Systems. (one cassette)

Also available is a videotape of James Popham, University of California at Los Angeles, discussing mini-lessons. It can be purchased on either half-inch or one-inch tape, both on EIAJ standard. The price is: half-inch $65; one-inch $75. Make checks payable to Teacher Education Developmental Service. Orders should be submitted to Judith B. Adrezin, Materials Coordinator, Education Building B–9, State University of New York at Albany, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12203.

Hofstra—Manhasset Project Competency Evaluation

by Esin Kaya
Hofstra University, Long Island, N.Y.

The Hofstra-Manhasset project is the result of several years of work by the Consortium Policy Board which was established under the New Guidelines for Certification, circulated by the New York State Education Department. In the Consortium, Hofstra University was represented by a dean, three faculty members from the departments of early childhood, secondary education, and educational psychology, and three students from these departments. The Manhasset and Glen Cove School Districts had as representatives a school superintendent, a school board member, and a representative of the Teacher's Association. Educational Testing Service was represented by members of the Teacher Behavior Group.

EVALUATION OF COMPETENCIES

Performance evaluation needs to be in terms of observables. It also needs to conform to the tenets of "good" evaluation by being objective, reliable, and valid. Given the lack of widely accepted techniques for performance evaluation related to the specific set of competencies in the trial project, project staff had to deal with such questions as: What can be used for evaluation? Who is to conduct the evaluation? What process of evaluation is both acceptable, practically feasible, and yet not traumatic for the students? Following is the description of how we solved, temporarily, if not ideally, these problems.

(Continued on page 10)

Hofstra . . . *(continued)*

What can be used for evaluation?

Competencies are best demonstrated in behavior, in products created by the students, and in test performance. Since we do not have any standardized performance tests, we accept as test performance the responses to test questions built into the instructional modules when these are available. Such test performance constitutes one type of assessable data. A second type consists of projects, lesson plans, curricular materials, etc., which the student produces in the course of his preparation. These products can be viewed by any number of judges, and can be judged to meet or not to meet agreed-upon competency criteria. Demonstration of the desired behavior in a natural setting constitutes the third category of acceptable data. When possible, a demonstration session is set up in the natural environment of a classroom where the student performs a predetermined set of skills before a group of observers or video equipment. When such a demonstration is not possible, the setting for the demonstration is simulated, and the student again gives the demonstration, either with video equipment or with observers present. All four of the above are accepted as data which can be used to assess whether or not a student has achieved the competencies he contracted to achieve.

Who conducts the evaluation?

Hofstra faculty and cooperating schoolteachers who have assumed the responsibility for the instruction in the competencies, participate also in the evaluation of the competency. However, to ensure objectivity, a third, qualified evaluator is added. This third evaluator is usually someone who has not participated in instruction but who is informed of the evaluation criteria to be used by all three independent judges. It can be someone from Educational Testing Service, someone from the Management-Policy Board, another teacher or staff member from the school system, or another faculty member from the university. The important qualifications for the third evaluator are neutrality, familiarity with sound evaluation techniques, and familiarity with the competency being evaluated.

What is the process of evaluation?

Currently there are few, if any, established evaluation criteria for competency statements. Therefore, the evaluators, together with the student, must come to some agreement as to what the evaluation criteria will be.

Following is the policy decided by the Management-Policy Board with regard to competency evaluation in the competency-based program. This policy is based on the philosophy that: (a) competency evaluation needs to be objective; (b) competencies achieved by the student must be demonstrable in more than one situation; (c) since there are a very large number of specific skills to be evaluated, the method of evaluation must take into account the practical limitations.

(1) Evaluation of competencies will be done by a cooperating teacher, the student teacher, a Hofstra University faculty member, and sometimes by an independent observer (evaluator) at the initiation of any one of these people.

(2) Any single party above, in addition to the student teacher, may assess the student's performance and subsequently offer evidence of achievement of the competency (competencies). Examples of what constitutes evidence are:
   (a) *student products* such as lesson plans prepared by the student, curricular materials developed, research reports written, responses to criterion-referenced tests, etc.
   (b) *observer's written account* of student behavior representing the competency being evaluated, such as logs or diaries kept by cooperating teachers or Hofstra faculty, running accounts of observation, etc.
   (c) *audio- or videotapes* of student behavior being evaluated.

   Such objective evidence is then reviewed by the other members of the evaluating team.

(3) Decision regarding the achievement of competencies shall be based on the consensus of the parties cited in No. (1) above. If consensus is not reached, the following procedure will be followed:
   (a) dialog among those involved toward consensus
   (b) a plan created for training in the competencies not met
   (c) reevaluation

(4) A master checklist of competencies (see attached form) will be entered in a student's file after evaluation session. This master list will reflect consensus rather than individual evaluations of the competencies in question. It will indicate the names of the evaluators, the date of competency achievement, and the evidence accepted for evaluation.

(5) At a weekly meeting of student teacher, Hofstra advisor, and cooperating teacher:
   (a) student teacher will submit a plan and schedule of his proposed activities for the coming week. This will include a tentative list of competencies that may result from that week's activities.
   (b) evaluation of competencies in the previous week's plan will take place at this meeting.

(6) While a large number of competencies will be evaluated by the cooperating teacher and the Hofstra advisor with the student present at these weekly meetings, a representative sample of competencies may be evaluated or reevaluated at the request of any single party listed in paragraph (1) above, or of anyone connected with the competency-based program, who would like to see competencies demonstrated.

Instruction in the program

Instruction in the program is highly individualized. Each student is placed in the school district full time on the basis of interest in and need for a specific type of classroom (e.g. multigrade, open vs. self contained). The cooperating teacher(s) and Hofstra faculty share the instructional responsibility for the student. A three-way conference is held each week with the student, faculty advisor, and cooperating teacher to coordinate the learning activities in which the student is to be engaged. These may vary from spending full time in the classroom with specific assignments, to conducting independent study, to gathering information and materials in order to develop curricular materials.

Where feasable, audio- and videotapes are utilized for purposes of microteaching, and independent study modules developed in other places such as the Weber State College are used by the students.

Program evaluation

The basic evaluative approach to program evaluation is based on the systems model suggested by Etzioni (1960). This approach views an organization as "a social unit which is capable of achieving a goal." Ultimately, program success cannot be measured in terms of its primary goal, namely, the improvement of teacher preparation through a competency-based model; one must consider, also, the subordinate goals. Program success in terms of a number of interrelated goals is a complex, multidimensional concept. It includes not only the quality of the product, namely the teacher prepared and the competencies he or she can demonstrate, but also the processes through which the organization functions, and through which the program is implemented. During the first year of the trial project, this process evaluation is perceived as extremely important, since it (a) helps document the problems and their solutions in a period of transition, and (b) provides continuing feedback to the project coordinator who can use the data to identify the needs and to take action in accordance with those needs. In fact, the identification of the problems and needs for which funds are being sought is the direct consequence of this process evaluation.

The process evaluation is conducted by two evaluators, doctoral interns in the educational psychology program, hired for this

(Continued on page 11)

purpose. They use as data: (a) products of the project such as modules that are developed, evaluation techniques that are established, forms and procedures that are developed, etc. (b) observations they conduct in classrooms, at all management, implementation, or instructional meetings; (c) logs that may be kept by some individuals participating on the trial project; (d) types of competencies achieved by the students. They assess the data they collected in the context of three main questions:

— How well is the management suited to implementing a competency-based program?

— How well is the program being implemented in comparison to its original goals?

— How well is the instructional system suited to achieving competencies?

The evaluator keeps in touch with the project coordinator by submitting periodic evaluation reports with recommendations, and sometimes, when they observe an urgent need for action that cannot wait until a report is typed and submitted, by requesting a conference. Plans are under way to make these evaluation reports to the full Management-Policy Board, rather than only to the program coordinator.

Problems which still need to be solved

The report, so far, has described the solutions to problems concerning (a) management, (b) evaluating competencies, (c) conducting an individualized program with changing roles for faculty, teachers, and students. These solutions represent an initial progress, and in some cases have been devised tentatively in response to critical needs that had to be met in order for the project to be viable.

We still have some continuing unresolved needs, and others that have been identified as a result of our experience in the program. It should be noted that while we are currently engaged in devising means to resolve these, some of the basic ones cannot be dealt with without additional financial support.

The unresolved needs are described below.

I. Specification of teaching competencies in more behavioral terms than currently stated in the *Florida Catalogue of Competencies* is needed. The *Catalogue* currently constitutes the basis of our program. While the competency areas we have accepted are useful, the actual skills in these competency areas are not stated in a way to lend themselves to objective assessment. The competency areas which provide the baseline for further specification are: (a) assessing and evaluating students, (b) skills in planning for instruction, (c) communication skills, skills in group dynamics and personal interaction, (d) skills in administrative duties and classroom management, and (e) skills in self-assessment and self-improvement. In order to deal with the most urgent needs of the school district and, at the same time, limit ourselves to a manageable task, these competency areas will be viewed only in the context of reading and mathematics as content areas.

II. In addition to more behavioral specification of the competencies in each of the six areas, there is a need to establish:

- priorities as to which competencies and skills are more important under what circumstances;
- criteria for evaluating the skills as well as the more complex competencies;
- an open system which enables the modification of the selected set of competencies on the basis of (a) changing needs of schools and society, and (b) the already existing strengths and weak-

(Continued on page 12)

MULTI-STATE CONSORTIUM ON PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

PUBLICATIONS ORDER FORM

QUANTITY	DESCRIPTION	COST
_____	Strategies and Resources for Developing a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program by W. Robert Houston	_____
_____	Resources for Performance-Based Education by W. Robert Houston	_____
_____	Resources for Performance-Based Education—Supplement A by W. Robert Houston	_____
_____	Atlanta or Atlantis? by Theodore E. Andrews	_____
_____	What Has Been and Should Be the Role of State Education Agencies in the Development and Implementation of Teacher Education Programs (Both Pre and Inservice)? by K. Fred Daniel and Joseph W. Crenshaw (At present out of print)	_____
_____	Social Studies Competencies—Minnesota Department of Education (available April 1974)	_____
_____	Assessment by W. James Popham, Peter Airasian, Sandra Feldman, Jesse H. Garrison, Herbert Hite, Bruce R. Joyce, Bert Y. Kersh, Frederick McDonald, Bernard McKenna, Robert A. Roth, Barak Rosenshine, H. Del Schalock, Beatrice Ward (available May 1974)	_____

• • • • •

All publications available at $2.00 each.
Requests for copies should be made to:
National Dissemination Center for Performance-Based Education
c/o Dean James Collins
Room 123, Huntington Hall
150 Marshall Street, Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210

Checks should be made out to:
Dr. James Collins

Editorial

This issue of *PBTE* concludes its second academic year of publication (the next issue will appear in September). Following the first month run of 3,000 copies, the monthly circulation has now risen to over 19,000. That statistic alone indicates the growing interest in performance education. The many people who have commented positively on the newsletter are really complimenting the many authors who have contributed their efforts. To these people (now numbering in the hundreds) the editor is truly indebted.

This newsletter, the monograph series, and the various conferences, meetings, and projects of the Consortium are truly a reflection of the dedication and efforts of each of the state representatives who have made all policy decisions as well as coordinating specific related activities within each of their respective states. The Consortium itself is also deeply indebted for the support it has received from governmental officials. Grants from ESEA Title V, the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems, and Teacher Corps, have enabled the Consortium to expand both its activities and its membership. Publicly, the Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education would like to acknowledge its appreciation to Stuart Dean, Title V; Allen Schmieder, NCIES; and James Steffensen, Teacher Corps, for their initial and continuing support for and involvement with the Consortium. Finally, William Smith, formerly with NCIES and presently director of Teacher Corps, has made significant and timely decisions affecting the Consortium. His efforts have been of exceptional importance.

To each of the above, the Consortium is indebted.

Study in New York State

A program specifically designed to explore and research the rationale, design, organization, and implementation of CBTE/PBTE programs in New York State is being offered at Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y. in the summer session of 1974. The program will include an analysis of CBTE/PBTE trends and developments, teaching center organization, and application of theory to emergent roles of community participants, teachers, administrators, and college personnel.

If interested, call Donald Cannon, director of teacher education, (716) 883-7000, ext. 224.

Hofstra . . . *(concluded)*

nesses of a given individual student at the point of entry into the program;

- a validation system for the selected competencies and skills using current educational needs perceived by schools and universities as independent validation criteria.

III. There is an urgent need to describe a management system which will facilitate the implementation of a competency-based program which emphasizes (a) individualized diagnosis at the point of entry into the program; (b) individualized instruction with a great deal of independent study, microteaching, field-based experience; (c) changing roles for both university faculty and schoolteachers. Such a management system needs to:

- provide inservice instruction to faculty and teachers in order to:
  (1) change their attitudes to be more favorable to competency-based programs;
  (2) prepare them to take on new instructional functions in the context of competency-based programs;
  (3) prepare them to be accountable in terms of their products and instructional processes;
  (4) prepare them to use objective assessment techniques based on observable behavior and products rather than "course completion";
- provide an incentive system in faculty and teacher evaluation processes which moves away from a rigid 3-credit per course accounting to a flexible load arrangement related to the functions being performed;
- provide for coordination and liaison for field-based instruction where faculty can spend more time in the schools, and teachers can spend more time in the university;
- provide for staff deployment based on strengths and interests of the individuals rather than expecting all staff to perform the same tasks;
- be an open system which can be modified to adjust to differences which are likely to exist among school districts which may be added as cooperating institutions in a competency-based training program. ■

MULTI-STATE CONSORTIUM ON PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION

STATE	*REPRESENTATIVE*
Washington	Edwin L. Lyle
Oregon	James Wallace
Utah	Roger C. Mouritsen
Arizona	John Potts
Texas	Tom T. Walker
Minnesota	Patricia J. Goralski
Vermont	Robert Vail
New York	Vincent C. Gazzetta
Florida	Nell Kannwischer
New Jersey	Ward Sinclair
California	Peter L. LoPresti

Administering State: New York

Project Director
Theodore E. Andrews
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12210

Stuart E. Dean
United States
Office of Education Representative

Syracuse University Coordinator
James Collins

Editor
Theodore E. Andrews

Funded
by
United States Office of Education
Title V, Section 505, Grant
and
Syracuse University Projects
Supported
by
Teacher Corps
and
National Center For the Improvement
of Educational Systems